2

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1415

17

16

18 19

20

21

2223

24

25

27

26

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

Mert Duymayan,

Plaintiff,

v.

FBI Las Vegas,

Defendant.

Case No. 2:25-cv-00224-RFB-DJA

Order

Pro se Plaintiff Mert Duymayan filed an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. (ECF No. 1). However, Plaintiff's application is missing certain information. The Court thus denies Plaintiff's application without prejudice.

I. <u>Discussion.</u>

Under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1), a plaintiff may bring a civil action "without prepayment of fees or security therefor" if the plaintiff submits a financial affidavit that demonstrates the plaintiff "is unable to pay such fees or give security therefor." The Ninth Circuit has recognized that "there is no formula set forth by statute, regulation, or case law to determine when someone is poor enough to earn [in forma pauperis] status." Escobedo v. Applebees, 787 F.3d 1226, 1235 (9th Cir. 2015). An applicant need not be destitute to qualify for a waiver of costs and fees, but he must demonstrate that because of his poverty he cannot pay those costs and still provide himself with the necessities of life. Adkins v. E.I DuPont de Nemours & Co., 335 U.S. 331, 339 (1948).

The applicant's affidavit must state the facts regarding the individual's poverty "with some particularity, definiteness and certainty." *United States v. McQuade*, 647 F.2d 938, 940 (9th Cir. 1981) (citation omitted). If an individual is unable or unwilling to verify his or her poverty, district courts have the discretion to make a factual inquiry into a plaintiff's financial status and to deny a request to proceed *in forma pauperis*. *See, e.g., Marin v. Hahn*, 271

11 12

14 15

16

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Fed.Appx. 578 (9th Cir. 2008) (finding that the district court did not abuse its discretion by denying the plaintiff's request to proceed in forma pauperis because he "failed to verify his poverty adequately"). "Such affidavit must include a complete statement of the plaintiff's personal assets." Harper v. San Diego City Admin. Bldg., No. 16-cv-00768 AJB (BLM), 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 192145, at *1 (S.D. Cal. June 9, 2016). Misrepresentation of assets is sufficient grounds for denying an in forma pauperis application. Cf. Kennedy v. Huibregtse, 831 F.3d 441, 443-44 (7th Cir. 2016) (affirming dismissal with prejudice after litigant misrepresented assets on in forma pauperis application).

Plaintiff's application contains contradictory information because he claims to make no money from employment or any other source, but asserts that he pays \$1,100 in rent, utilities, and insurance each month. It is not clear how Plaintiff pays these bills given his assertion to make no money from any source. Given these contradictions, the Court cannot determine whether Plaintiff qualifies for in forma pauperis status. The Court will give Plaintiff one opportunity to file a complete in forma pauperis application. The Court further orders that Plaintiff may not respond with a zero or "not applicable" in response to any question without providing an explanation for each of the questions. Plaintiff also may not leave any questions blank. Plaintiff must describe each source of money that he receives, state the amount he received, and what he expects to receive in the future.

The Court denies Plaintiff's in forma pauperis application without prejudice. The Court gives Plaintiff 30 days to file an updated application. Plaintiff must fully answer all applicable questions and check all applicable boxes. Plaintiff may alternatively pay the filing fee in full. Since the Court denies Plaintiff's application, it does not screen the complaint at this time.

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis (ECF No. 1) is denied without prejudice.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Plaintiff has until April 21, 2025, to file an updated application to proceed in forma pauperis as specified in this order or pay the filing fee. Failure to

timely comply with this order may result in a recommendation to the district judge that this case be dismissed. IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Clerk of Court is kindly directed to send Plaintiff a copy of this order and of the short form application to proceed in forma pauperis and its instructions.1 DATED: March 21, 2025 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE ¹ This form and its instructions can also be found at https://www.nvd.uscourts.gov/court- information/forms/ under Code AO 240.

Document 4

Filed 03/21/25

Page 3 of 3

Case 2:25-cv-00224-RFB-DJA